

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CASBN 118321)  
United States Attorney

2 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549)  
Chief, Criminal Division

4 TAMARA WEBER (ILSBN 6270925)  
Special Assistant United States Attorney

5 450 Golden Gate Avenue; Box 36055  
6 San Francisco, California 94102  
7 Telephone: (415) 436-6838  
FAX: (415) 436-7234  
tamara.weber@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

13  
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. 06-0782 PJH  
15 Plaintiff, ) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
16 v. ) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
17 GUILLERMO GONZALEZ-RANGEL )  
18 Defendant. ) SAN FRANCISCO VENUE  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
20

21 On December 21, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a Trial  
22 Setting/Change of Plea Hearing. At that time, the parties stipulated that time should be  
23 excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from December 21, 2006, through  
24 January 17, 2007, for effective preparation of defense counsel, in that defense counsel  
25 required time to review discovery and to confer with an immigration consultant. The  
26 parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for  
27 effective preparation of both defense counsel and the United States, taking into account  
28 //

1 the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed  
2 that the end of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests  
3 of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

4 **IT IS SO STIPULATED.**

5 Respectfully submitted,

7 KEVIN V. RYAN  
8 United States Attorney

9 DATED: 12/21/06

10 \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ Tamara Weber  
11 TAMARA WEBER  
12 Special Assistant United States Attorney

13 DATED: 12/21/06

14 \_\_\_\_\_ /s/ Geoffrey Hansen  
15 GEOFFREY HANSEN  
16 Attorney for Defendant Guillermo Gonzalez-  
17 Rangel

18 As the Court found on December 21, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court  
19 finds that an exclusion of time between December 21, 2006, through January 17, 2007, is  
20 warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best  
21 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A).  
22 The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel the reasonable  
23 time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence,  
24 and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

25 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

26 DATED: 12/22/06

